

REMARKS

Claims 1-3 and 8-10 are currently pending in this application, with Claims 1 and 8 being independent claims. As indicated above, Claims 8-10 are newly added.

In the Office Action, Claims 1-3 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Kikinis* (U.S. 6,243,596) in view of *Tsukamoto et al.* (U.S. 5,005,013), *Lagoni et al.* (U.S. 6,141,058), *Porco* (U.S. 4,873,712), *Zato* (U.S. 4,465,902), and *Reyes et al.* (U.S. 5,835,578). Applicants respectfully disagree.

More specifically, in rejecting independent Claim 1, the Examiner cites FIG. 4 of *Lagoni* as allegedly teaching the third incoming call alarm mode comprises displaying one of an incoming call character message and a preset graphic message. Specifically, the Examiner cites displaying caller ID, as described in column 4, lines 23-31, of *Lagoni* as allegedly teaching “the third incoming call alarm mode comprises displaying an incoming call character message” and FIG. 4 as allegedly teaching “the third incoming call alarm mode comprises displaying a preset graphic message.” However, FIG. 4 of *Lagoni* merely illustrates displaying the caller ID and an active video 460. That is, contrary to the Examiner’s assertion, there is nothing in FIG. 4 that teaches or suggests “the third incoming call alarm mode comprises displaying a preset graphic message.” Further, none of the Examiner’s other cited art cures this deficiency of *Lagoni*.

Further, new independent Claim 8 is presented, as shown above, which in addition to the recitations of independent Claim 1, also recites that when the TV phone is set to text mode in the third incoming call alarm mode, text data in a flash memory is accessed and stored in a video memory and the text data stored in the video memory is outputted and displayed as the incoming call character message, and when the TV phone is not set to the text mode in the third incoming call alarm mode, graphic data in the flash memory is accessed and stored in the video memory and the graphic data stored in the video memory is outputted and displayed as the preset graphic message. It is respectfully submitted that none of the Examiner’s cited art, either alone or in combination, teaches or suggests this recitation.

Based at least on the foregoing, independent Claims 1 and 8 are believed to be patentably distinct over the Examiner's cited art and in condition for allowance. Without conceding the patentability per se of dependent Claims 2, 3, 9, and 10, these are likewise believed to be allowable by virtue of their dependence on their respective independent claims.

Accordingly, all of the claims pending in the Application, namely, Claims 1-3 and 8-10, are believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference or personal interview would facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, the Examiner may contact Applicants' attorney at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'D. M. Owens III', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Douglas M. Owens III
Reg. No. 51,314
Attorney for Applicants

THE FARRELL LAW FIRM, P.C.
290 Broadhollow Rd., Suite 210E
Melville, New York 11747
Tel: (516) 228-3565